Call to Order

The State P-16 Council convened June 17, 2009, at 9:00 a.m. at the Kentucky Department of Education, State Board Room, and Frankfort, Kentucky. Chair Donna Moore presided.

Roll Call

Members present: Annette Bridges, Ron Daley, Judy Gibbons, Billy Harper, Robert King, John Marks, Donna Moore, Kevin Noland, Phillip Rogers, Reecie Stagnolia

Approval of Minutes

The minutes of the March 11, 2009 P-16 Council meeting were approved.

Update from Local P-16 Councils – Ron Daley Ron Daley indicated his update would be brief because of the extended discussion later in the agenda about the role of local P-16 councils. In Eastern KY the presidents of all the public and private universities have united to form a common vision. At their last meeting, they decided to address Senate Bill 1 and how the colleges and universities can work with P-16 partners to assist in the successful implementation of that work. That group continues to meet and we will invite them to a later meeting to update us on that work.

He recognized the work of other P-16 councils. In southern Kentucky, Fred Carter is working with two new P-16 Councils, using surveys to help develop a consensus and strategies to go forward. He also introduced Dale Duvall who works with the Appalachia P-16 councils, and Dr. Sue Cain, who is very active with the Central Kentucky P-16 Council.

Goals and Future Direction of the Statewide P-16 Council Chair Donna Moore noted that the format of the agenda for this meeting is slightly different, and includes the original goals and intent of the P-16 Council. The P-16 Council is not statutorily mandated, but SB 1 has affirmed the type of collaborative work being done and has directed further efforts in these areas. Because of that important mandate, an item was placed on the agenda in order to discuss the goals and future direction of the statewide P-16 council and its relationship to the local P-16 councils. She invited the audience to join the members in this conversation to assure the council is using our time and resources as wisely as we can.

Moore recognized that the actual work is being done by the local councils. So the statewide council needs to have more involvement with their work and more of a two way conversation about their needs. In phone conversations there have been discussions on how to do this, by having the local councils involved more with the statewide meetings and having the state council members attend some local council meetings. She opened the floor for discussion, and asked Billy Harper for his thoughts on this.

Mr. Harper related that he did not know whether he should be excited or scared at this time. He feels the state is at an interesting point and the stars are lining up for a new opportunity in education. It feels similar to the beginning of

KERA. He asked the members to bear with him as we move forward. He feels that though the state council may not be statutorily required or have mandated powers and duties, he would prefer that the state council lead and act. He is excited about having the opportunity to chair because of the funding that may be available, the legislation that has been passed, and the leadership in this state. He wants us to maximize this opportunity and the only way to do this is to have input from everyone. We have to have full state engagement in this both input and the output. He emphasized that it is so important that we have meaningful dialogue. He wants to see us produce positive results for kids, move from P-16 to P-20, see workforce be more integrated, start engaging the idea of cradle to grave education, and have this be the body that brings this along.

Chair Moore noted that Mr. Harper would be chairing the group next year and asked the group what types of activities the state council should be undertaking, focusing on those things that can best be done collaboratively.

Robert King noted that there was a meeting earlier this week between Phil Rogers, Gary Cox, Sue Cain, and staff from KDE talking about the larger implementation of SB 1. One of the questions was once the new standards are adopted and the new assessment tools are selected, how can the state get the current corps of approximately 45,000 teachers across the state up to speed so that they not only know what the new standards include, but are prepared to teach the new standards and understand how to use the assessment tools. Who should be at the table for this discussion? The thinking was to build a mechanism for doing all of this work as quickly as we can, so there is consideration of aligning the educational cooperatives, the local P-16 councils and the public and private college campuses to engage in this effort. This group could play a fairly important role in translating what is being done to the public in easy to understand language. The transition will be difficult and having the parents and the general public understand what really is going on is important.

Kevin Noland agreed that the communication function is important. To echo and operationalize Billy Harper's comments, throughout this meeting, members may want to be thinking about the issues the group would like local councils to weigh in on. As constituent input is obtained, state council members need to assure that the agencies and constituents they represent are informed by that input and collaboration across the spectrum. And then once decisions are made, the local P-16 council members can help communicate at the local community level and facilitate assistance and understanding. All parties will have to effectively communicate to implement SB 1 and ARRA.

Phil Rogers agreed with what was being said. He noted that most of our councils have good relationships with the universities and coops in their area as well as with the community and businesses. It would be a great fit to have the statewide council working more at the board level and the local councils working with local groups to get this information out to teachers and university faculty members who will be putting it into practice. The vision is to have the universities lead the standards development/review process and using the coops as a distribution center. The universities are enthusiastic about being

included in the development work, but do not have large capacity for delivering it, which is what the coops do have and the local P-16s can assist with. This really will be a P-20 initiative, and will take all of us to make this happen.

Judy Gibbons wanted to comment on Mr. Harper's comments on business involvement. She feels this should occur on a much larger scale in all of our organizations. If our goal is to produce successful students who then become successful employees, the only way to do that is to have greater dialogue with business about their specific expectations.

One other thing, in NKY we have a lot of education organizations that do different parts of the work. She emphasized it may be the local P-16 council that might be the overarching structure that all of these agencies come together under, but regardless, we need to streamline, become more efficient and less duplicative of services.

Chair Moore indicated that Ron Daley had solicited input from local councils on these questions and their comments indicated the need to have some kind of an overarching clearinghouse or matrix put together so that there is awareness of best practices and success stories across the local councils.

Ron Daley shared a basic observation. He said that the stars are aligned for us to do some great things. This statewide P-16 council has grown and built capacity, added other members. We have gone beyond three administrations, had new heads to CPE and KDE. He has seen how P-16 initiatives are being institutionalized, and even though some activities may not be taking place under the auspices of the council, they have been influenced by thinking collaboratively though the P-20 lens.

Chair Moore asked for other comments. Annette Bridges said we have early childhood councils across the states, and we need to make sure that collaboration is occurring between local P-16 councils and local early childhood councils.

Chair Moore asked the local councils in the audience how the state council can assist them. Additional funding and a designated staff have been previously identified, but are there other ways the state council can assist and support? Tonya Crum, the representative from KET wanted to let people know KET is already involved in providing training to local school districts through an existing statewide local network and is available to be a part of the solution.

Sue Cain felt a need to begin defining again if college readiness and workforce readiness are the same so as we move forward we train appropriately and have a set(s) of standards that meet the needs of all students.

Dale Duvall supported the idea of the statewide councils attending local council meetings as this would help them see that their work is part of a larger effort. Chair Moore echoed that CPE meetings on university campuses have been helpful to build those relationships.

Larry Stinson agreed with King's suggestion that the state and local councils communicate information from the work being completed and remarked how well all of these ideas fit together with the KDE planning around Race to the Top funding.

Reecie Stagnolia added his office had been crossing the state talking to local adult education providers and carrying the message of preparing students for college and workforce readiness standards. They have been pushing that the goal is not just passage of the GED but passage at a score that will allow them to enter college without the need for developmental coursework. This is an ambitious goal, but the jobs of the future will require more than just a GED. They are also looking to ramp up the use of the Kentucky Employability Certificate. The National Association of Manufacturers has endorsed the National Career Readiness Certificate based on the Work Keys assessment, and 13 states are using some form of this, which increases the portability from state to state of this certificate. The workforce readiness is equally as important as the college readiness component of this work

John Marks agreed. He would like to see us reach the place where P-16 means postsecondary, rather than distinctions between college and workforce readiness, and where counselors begin to address postsecondary needs. The issue is assuring success in either pathway, and assuring appropriate preparation for each, whether the same or different in some areas.

Chair Moore closed the discussion by noting this is an excellent beginning conversation. Mr. Harper does not want this group to look back a year from now and wish we had done things, so if there are areas we need to address, he requested they be raised in order that they can be addressed. He emphasized his belief that this group can make a significant difference, however our role is defined. He is looking forward to an exciting year, but needs everyone on board to accomplish our goals.

Update on the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act (ARRA) Stinson called attention to two handouts - one explains the funding streams that apply to P-12 education and how they will be processed, and the other is a power point presentation that provides basic information about ARRA. Since the March meeting, KDE has notified districts of the availability of Title 1 and IDEA funding under the ARRA. There has been an opportunity for districts to purchase food service equipment and modify their buses for emissions controls, as well as to purchase hybrid buses. Options are being explored for bonding for school construction.

Much KDE time is being spent in preparation for applying for the competitive Race to the Top funding. The governor has given clarity on the use of the State Fiscal Stabilization Fund (SFSF) in the 2010 budget, and those dollars will be used to hold the SEEK formula harmless and keep P-12 funding at the same level as in 2009.

As far as competitive ARRA grants, there appears to be less to go to the states because the Secretary is holding back some funding to accomplish some objectives. One of the good things about this is he is using this to do some things Kentucky is already doing, which is exciting. KDE is already involved

in the effort to come up with a Common Core of standards that are fewer, higher and deeper. This is also what SB 1 is about, so this helps to provide funding to make that happen. Last week, Secretary Duncan decided some of the funding will be needed to develop assessments to measure mastery of the standards, and this also fits in very well with our work under SB 1. The SB 1 work fits in well with Kentucky's ideas for the Race to the Top application. A number of brainstorming sessions have been held within KDE; and Stinson described some of the thoughts around this work. He noted the desire to create a new culture, a new way of thinking that focuses on learning, including professional learning for adults.

A concept paper is being developed that describes this vision with more eloquence and clarity; then we plan to share that and determine how to develop that into a formal proposal. We are working in partnerships with other states and national organizations, and we will certainly be working with other agencies within the state as we go forward. The timeline on this is being extended. Initially guidance was expected at the beginning of March but we are now talking about an end of July release for comment and the first round of applications due in December with the first round of notifications due soon thereafter. There will be an additional application process next spring that will not be awarded until next fall. So there is plenty of time to develop an outstanding proposal. It is our intent to present a proposal that cannot be ignored; that will demand funding. Information is indicating there is still an emphasis on cross-state collaboration, but that each state will be required to submit an individual application and will receive individual awards. There is still an expectation that states are collaborating to make more effective and efficient use of those dollars, and KDE is involved with a variety of initiatives that will lead toward that.

## Chair Moor asked for questions.

Ron Crouch commented that he was now retired from state government, and raised issues about changes in the use of data collection instruments that determine the amount of federal funding to be received by school districts. This will be a major issue because it will mean that funding will be based on estimates using one-year as opposed to ten-year data.

John Marks noted an awareness issue relative to Career and Technical Education. In this budget cycle, they are undertaking a 2.6% cut in general fund dollars. SEEK funding is held harmless but the general fund dollars are not available to fund the other side. They are not eligible to receive ARRA dollars that are distributed to school districts, which means they are operating at very bare bones levels. This will require shutting down classes that are full and deferring maintenance. Stinson agreed and noted that while SEEK is being held constant for local school districts, some would argue that is not harmless because districts will not receive the increase they had anticipated ion the state budget. In addition, other funding streams outside SEEK will absorb that 2.6% cut which amounts to about another \$9M reduction to those other funding streams and to KDE.

King referred to another set of provisions that directed billions of dollars to

agencies that support research. One of things CPE did was convene a meeting of our campus presidents, vice-presidents for research and provosts to brainstorm the question of how the state is positioned and how our position can be enhanced in order to be able to effectively compete for these dollars that are in agencies as varied as agriculture, health and human services, energy, defense, etc. They searched for opportunities that fit with the expertise that resides on our campuses, and fit with industries that were located in the state. They looked at opportunities where they could collaboratively combine multi-university and/or multi-industry partners. They realize that "big science" today takes more than what most single universities can bring to the table, and demands these collaborative efforts.

The group identified seven different areas that t are of particular interest in KY and fit with the expertise and the commercial interests in the state. They then assembled faculty and asked each of the groups to develop a three-page concept paper, and ended up with 58 different ideas for using this federal money. The concept papers created some new collaborative activities across campuses as well as building some partnerships outside of the university world. They hope as federal agencies issue guidance and RFPS, these teams of investigators will be prepared to apply quickly as time windows will be very tight. To the extent that the homework has been done, the moment it is available staff will be well positioned to go after that money. They feel these activities have enhanced our chances for these opportunities.

Chair Moore asked for other comments. Having none, she moved to the item on implementation of Senate Bill 1.

Implementation of Senate Bill 1 Chair Moore introduced Ken Draut, who thanked the chair for the time on the agenda to get some feedback from them. Draut gave an overview of SB 1 and the work that is going on in that area. He then turned the discussion over to Robin Chandler and Sue Cain to discuss the work around the development of the Common Core standards.

Ms. Chandler indicated KDE staff has been working closely with partners at CPE to come up with a process to go through standards revision, assuring that workforce readiness are the same as college readiness standards. The goal is to make sure that when students leave high school they are ready for college or the workplace so that would mean the same, not different, sets of standards. SB1 called upon KDE and CPE to work together to plan a comprehensive process for revising the academic content standards. In the materials is a copy of the plan, dated April 24, 2009. As many are aware, the field has felt overwhelmed with the number of standards that they have had to prepare students to master, so fewer and more in-depth standards are very important to them. They will be based on evidence-based research, and will be internationally benchmarked. Staff will ensure that the standards are common from high school to those introductory course expectations in postsecondary. Ms. Chandler outlined the groups of people who will be involved, and reminded the board they will be keeping all of the boards as well as the P-16 council informed as the work goes forward. There will be a steering committee, and will also be a college readiness work group. Cain noted this group is discussed near the end of SB 1. It discussed students coming through

not meeting the standards, and requires an increase by 3% annually in the number of students at postsecondary institutions getting their degree. Dr. Rogers asked whether the 3% graduation rate is for those students graduating in six years. He asked if what he read was correct that those who graduated after going through the remediation programs were more successful than those students who did not go through the remediation program. Cain clarified that these students are just as successful as those who did not. Ms. Chandler clarified how the group membership will be expected to cross pollinate. The steering committee will make sure that the process flows and timelines are met. The makeup of the steering committee is important as they will have a very important role in this process.

The content workgroup membership will include broad representation from both P-12 and postsecondary. The math workgroup will meet Monday at the CPE offices. The college readiness workgroup will meet by the end of next week. Ms. Chandler explained the role of the workgroup is to analyze the common standards that are released based on the work at the national level. They will make recommendations on the adoption and the revisions needed at each grade level. They will review and define the standards for postsecondary introductory courses and assure the P-12 standards match readiness levels of success for college and workforce. Rogers asked if we would receive these from the chiefs by grade level and she indicated that we were supposed to receive them down to the third grade level.

Ms. Chandler explained that many have seen the press release about the work at the national level and the MOA that we have signed on to be a part of that work. Forty-nine (49) states and territories will be involved in this work. CCSSO has called together ACT, Achieve, the College Board, and other experts to come up with a common core of standards agreed upon by these groups. They will be validated so there will be research behind these standards. The MOA required states to sign there would be 85% agreement. States do have the opportunity to opt out, but with the SB1 work there is a need for us to have agreement about those standards. When we revised our standards in 2006 we consulted those groups as well so we are not expecting to see major surprises.

Their timeline is being influenced by our SB 1 needs. In July 2009 we are expecting the math and English/language arts (E/LA) common standards to be released for state input. In fall of 2009, KY will do some analysis and provide some input and in December 2009 finalization and approval of those mathematics and English/language arts standards is expected. As you know, SB 1 required mathematics standards to be out to the field by December 2009, and we hope to be able to speed up the process of having the English/language arts standards out in the field. Cain noted that this has had the positive effect of meeting the language arts timelines earlier. Ms. Chandler noted we do have plans to revise the other content standards as well, but it makes perfect sense to start with these two very important areas and we are pleased the national work is supporting that.

Cain noted they have asked faculty and staff who are already working on college readiness projects through their coops and local P-16 councils to be a

part of this work to link it out to those groups, and they remain very open to any ideas that are being used out in the field. She will be sending forward some of the work she has seen from around the state. They are looking at best practices in retention for underprepared students. While their programs are working, they lose many of these students so organizing these unified strategies is critical. Another thing emphasized is the importance of using adult education programs to assist in remediation programs. Adult education is in process of revising their standards and so have been thinking about college readiness in their programs. There is lots of great work being done on all levels here. The next steps will be to ensure the professional development about the standards, assessments, intervention systems and strategies and also ensure the P-20 data system is viable to help us carry out our plans. She asked if there were questions.

Linda Linville asked if the technology standards would be embedded in the other standards or whether they would be stand alone. She clarified that before a faculty member can teach technology they must learn it, so where in the pipeline will the technology be taught? Are there going to be standards for the teaching and learning of technology? Ms. Chandler explained that this is already in place in P-12, that those standards are included in our current Program of Studies so we will be helping our students interact with that technology. One of our high school graduation requirements is for students to demonstrate technology competency. Dr. Linville did not see this on the chart and wanted to make sure that it was brought to someone's attention.

Mr. Marks mentioned that he really liked the P-12 to postsecondary language as it was inclusive and felt that would be a good name for this group. He added that when it comes to development and implementation of Program Review processes, Career and Technical Education has long been involved in that process and could be some help in that area. He commented that while the document speaks to workforce readiness there is not a strong workforce presence on the committee. He felt some industry presence could be useful there, as well as on the steering committee.

Ms. Chandler provided additional information about program reviews. SB 1 required a program review process be developed in Arts and Humanities, Practical Living/Career Studies and writing. The process will help schools look at their programs for the purpose of instructional improvement, and providing reporting and accountability measures to the larger community. Within SB1 there were several components that drive the program review development process. They synthesized these components from SB 1; then combined them in a way to guide the program review development. She reviewed the elements, which mirror some of the same broad headings in the Standards and Indicators for School Improvement (SISI) document that schools are familiar with. The idea is to make this manageable - a living process that is ongoing and a part of their culture and the way they do business.

Mr. Marks discussed SACS and how they are willing to come in to assist with projects such as this that states are undertaking. He is on the state council and would be happy to provide information. Robin indicated that they would be

most appreciative of and willing to receive any assistance they could provide.

Expansion of pre-Kindergarten and the Collaboration Between K-12 and Postsecondary Programs Cindy Heine, Associate Executive Director of the Prichard Committee addressed the group regarding the Prichard Committee's current focus on prekindergarten. In 1985, when the Prichard Committee issued a report on elementary and secondary education, the report recommended that every family who wanted access to quality preschool for 3-4 year olds should have such access. At that time, research was available out of the Perry Preschool project in Michigan that illustrated the benefits of providing quality preschool to all children. At that time most students who were receiving preschool were either those who were poor who received it through Head Start or those more wealthy children whose parents were privately providing it. This left out a large number of students. Kentucky was fortunate in 1990 with the enactment of KERA that preschool was included and today those programs have been expanded to include four year olds from families at 150% of poverty levels. and all 3 – 4 children with disabilities. With the enactment of KIDS NOW, a variety of initiatives to support preschool education, Kentucky has a strong base of support to establish universal voluntary preschool.

The Prichard Committee has joined a national effort with the Pew Charitable Trusts to begin a new campaign to expand preschool for young children. The eventual goal is to provide universal voluntary preschool but the interim goal is to provide preschool for 3 and 4 year old children from families at 200% of the poverty level.

As they began this work, they pulled together a group at the state level that included constituent groups engaged in early childhood work. That group looked at the next best steps to accomplish the goals. One of the first things that became very clear is that the state cannot expand preschool in school buildings without doing harm to child care centers. As school-based preschool expanded in 1990s, those children were being pulled out of private child-care centers. These small businesses needed to provide care to children up to school age to stay in business, since the cost of care of infants and toddlers is greater than the cost of care for 3 -4 year olds. So that move placed a number of these businesses in jeopardy. The other thing to be remembered is that the first two years are the most important for brain development, so we must address the needs of these children.

Thus, the key recommendation that came out of these discussions was to focus on a collaborative delivery model. In other words, instead of giving more money to schools, all of our public and private programs should be working together in a diverse delivery model. One suggestion is that these partners begin thinking together about how to best expand services collaboratively.

Another issue is the availability of prepared teachers trained to address needs of childhood development. The state does not yet have the level of quality desired, but this is being pursued. The cost—benefit analysis is compelling - the return can be \$2 -\$16 savings in social services for every dollar invested in preschool. This is also a pervasive issue for working parents.

One of the elements of the KIDS NOW program was scholarship money to

provide education for preschool providers. A side benefit of this is that state colleges and universities can expand teacher training programs to address this area of need. One of the things they are pushing hard on is to try to get rid of silos.

Ms. Heine shared that the cost of starting an early childhood classroom is about \$225,000 while the cost of reconfiguring a currently existing on is about \$50,000. This allows money to be invested in teachers and services instead of buildings. This underscores the need for collaboration and blending of funds. One of the things our educators were concerned with was quality. One recommendation is that the centers that participate would have to demonstrate a level of quality, through means such as the STARS quality rating. They are trying to make recommendations for expanding services but also assuring quality.

The Strong Start program has engaged a number of people, including Business Leadership Councils that have identified speakers from the business community to make presentations about the work. That is starting to roll out. They would love the opportunity to talk to local P-16 councils. They are also working with KSBA to assist them in getting information to their members about the value of expanding services and the value of quality programs.

The governor created as Task Force on Early Childhood. This is co chaired by Cabinet Secretaries Helen Mountjoy and Jamie Miller, which is setting an example of bring forward collaborative efforts between education and human services. It is looking at making recommendations for legislative action.

There is a lot of activity around early care and education. We know the budget does not lend itself to rapid expansion. But the goal is to be sure that the policy makers join with our governor to understand that the minute there are funds available to expand. That is the first place to invest dollars, and in a way that benefits children and families.

Ms. Heine answered members' questions about the program. Mr. Harper indicated he hoped the data systems would include data about these students as they enter the system and data is available so that interventions can occur as early as is possible. King expressed a need for more current Kentucky-based data in order to demonstrate that students who go through quality programs perform at levels that are demonstrably higher when they get to elementary school. This would be very powerful. Annette Bridges noted that there is a study that is currently taking place with the University of Kentucky. King noted that the money is going away over time and data will be needed to convince the legislature to replace that funding. Mr. Harper noted that Judy Clabes, formerly with the Scripps-Howard Foundation, has pulled together a KY Commission on Philanthropy, working with the Governor and early care and education and child health are the two priorities. There are subgroups for each that will be making recommendations as to how they could invest dollars in programs that would expand this effort. Reecie noted there are grandparents and parents without a GED that are ill equipped to assist their children in school.

P-20 Data Warehouse

Al Lind and Robert Hackworth came forward to discuss the P-20 Data Warehouse. Lind announced the awarding of a \$2.9 M grant from the USDE to expand the P-20 data warehouse. One of the reasons it was a successful application is because it has a governance structure that is cross-agency (KDE, CPE, EPSB) in nature. It also has a very explicit model for data deidentification that satisfies all of the lawyers and FERPA. The grant also built in some design time and resources. Staffs plan to take sufficient time and bring in some experts to assure that it is right going forward since this is all very new.

In the materials Stinson handed out earlier, one of the assurances that Kentucky gives for eligibility for SFSF money is that the state is committed to putting a system such as this in place. This is not only something P-16 has been supporting for years, but the federal government is now saying a s a prerequisite for receipt of additional stimulus funds, the state must commit to move forward with this aggressively. There are some funding issues being worked on that hopefully will be solved as the project moves forward.

He also shared that Charles McGrew, formerly of CPE has moved to the Data Quality Campaign. His role is to advise the federal government on this program as well as the stimulus fund program.

Robert Hackworth provided a quick overview of what it is we will be trying to accomplish over the next several years. One point he wanted to share is that the KIDS system is being rebranded as the KY SLDS for several reasons. One is because it is more closely ties to the name given to these systems by the federal government. Another is because many of our legislators did not understand what KIDS was, and so it was felt that tying it to the statewide longitudinal data system might clarify that. He clarified that going forward in Phase 2; the plan is to merge data collected by the agencies. In Phase 3 a real rollout of the system begins with training staff to use the system and the data that the system produces to inform instructional practice. There may be changes in the project going forward, but they will likely be minor.

Mr. Hackworth also noted that a new round of SLDS grants is slated to be announced sometime next week. This confirms that the federal government has decided that SLDS are larger than just P-12 systems. This is in line with the vision the KIDS team has had for a number of years to create this system for all Kentuckians. This next round will focus on workforce data and will provide opportunity to pull in more sources of data than originally expected. The agencies are thinking about several teams to work on this right now, with development work beginning on the new application in the coming weeks, even as we begin the implementation work on our current grant.

Rogers noted we are struggling to find money for the operational phase. He wanted to know what the number was we were looking at that was needed to support the current system. Stinson noted the figures range for a low of \$750,000 per yr. to \$2M per year depending on costs included. Rogers expressed a need to come up with a reliable figure for operating costs. He asked if it would be helpful when requesting the money from the legislature to have a letter from the state P-16 Council expressing the importance of this

work and their support for funding the operating costs of the system. Mr. Hackworth indicated that it would be very helpful. Stinson also pointed out the requirements in SB 1 that would support such a request, and felt that the SLDS is foundational to the data that is needed to be successful in implementation of SB 1.

Rogers made a motion that we send a letter to Governor Beshear with a copy to legislative leadership expressing support for the provision of funds needed to continue to support the statewide longitudinal data system formerly known as KIDS. The motion passed unanimously.

King asked how far the grant would allow us to proceed. Lind replied that it would take the work KDE has done and the work CPE has done with KPEDS and put them together to a single repository. It is hopeful that with the new grant we could also bring in the workforce and financial aid data. Mr. Hackworth added there would also be connections to teacher and certification data. King asked how much money would be needed to totally complete the system. Lind said new SLDS grants may be for as much as \$20M per state. King also asked how long it would take for the system to be completed. Lind answered it would be about three years. King asked when the current grant would allow us to be functional. Hackworth felt it would be in the third year of the grant. The financial aid and workforce should be completed on a parallel track with the other information.

Reecie Stagnolia encouraged thinking sooner rather than later regarding the inclusion of the workforce data, such as the E3 data. As enhancing those systems is discussed, so should the possibility of integration with this system.

Lind introduced Dr. Heidi Hiemstra, the interim Director of Information Systems at CPE.

John Marks discussed the possibility of integrating the TEDS system into this system.

Ron Daley asked if the ARRA money for expansion of broadband included any applications from Kentucky. Stinson noted that Secretary Miller is leading up that initiative. Lind noted they had sent concept papers to Secretary Miller. He noted there is also some funding from NSF that may be available for cyber infrastructure and feels we have a leg up in that area. Stinson noted there is another \$9M of Enhancing Education Through Technology funding that we will make sure fits in with ongoing work.

Next Meeting Dates

The next meeting is scheduled for September 17, 2009

Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned.